



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/043,910

01/11/2002

Frank Lee

TRNDP006

7252

22434

7590

12/05/2006

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
P.O. BOX 70250
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER

MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/043,910

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Aravind K. Moorthy

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-17 and 19-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-17 and 19-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the RCE filed on 25 September 2006.
2. Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-25 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-25 have been rejected.
4. Claims 9, 18 and 26-35 have been cancelled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

5. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 25 September 2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-7, 10-17 and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Guthrie US 6,266,681 B1.

As to claim 1, Guthrie discloses a system for identifying undesirable content in responses sent in reply to a user request for content, the system comprising:

a user input device that generates a request for content including an address of a target server and a protocol field [column 6, lines 1-40];

a scan module that receives the user request for content and is capable of identifying the request as a request for content by scanning the protocol field and identifying a content-related protocol [column 6, lines 1-40];

a proxy module that modifies the request for content so that it is redirected to a proxy server [column 6, lines 1-40];

a network that routes the request for content to the proxy server [column 6, lines 1-40]; and

the proxy server that receives the request, forwards the request to the target server, and receives a response from the target server [column 6, lines 1-40].

As to claim 2, Guthrie discloses that the proxy server identifies undesirable content in the response and processes the response according to defined parameters [column 2, lines 22-63].

As to claim 3, Guthrie discloses that the proxy server sends at least a portion of the response to the user, the portion of the response not including the undesirable content [column 10, lines 14-51].

As to claim 4, Guthrie discloses that the proxy server sends a notification message back to the user, the notification message containing data related to the undesirable content [column 10, lines 14-51].

As to claim 5, Guthrie discloses the system further comprising:

a user preference module that receives user-defined parameters utilized by the proxy server when processing the response [column 9, lines 26-67].

As to claims 6 and 19, Guthrie discloses that the proxy module redirects the request to the proxy server by modifying the request [column 10, lines 14-51].

As to claims 7 and 20, Guthrie discloses that the proxy module modifies the request by adding a redirection destination header to the request [column 10, lines 14-51].

As to claim 10, Guthrie discloses that the defined parameters are proxy server default parameters [column 9, lines 26-67].

As to claim 11, Guthrie discloses that the defined parameters are user-defined parameters [column 9, lines 26-67].

As to claim 12, Guthrie discloses that the defined parameters are a combination of user-defined parameters and proxy server default parameters [column 9, lines 26-67].

As to claims 13 and 14, Guthrie discloses that the scan module and the proxy module are located in a network gateway device [column 10, lines 14-51].

As to claim 15, Guthrie discloses that the network gateway device further comprises a firewall and a router [column 10, lines 14-51].

As to claim 16, Guthrie discloses a method for identifying undesirable content in responses sent in reply to a user request for content, the method comprising:

- receiving input from a user including at least one request for content addressed to a target server, the request having an address of the target server and a protocol field [column 6, lines 1-40];

- identifying the request for content by scanning the protocol field and identifying a content-related protocol [column 6, lines 1-40];

- redirecting the request for content to a proxy server [column 6, lines 1-40];

- receiving the request for content at the proxy server [column 6, lines 1-40];

- sending the request for content from the proxy server to the target server for generation of a response [column 6, lines 1-40];

- receiving the response from the target server at the proxy server [column 6, lines 1-40];

- scanning the response for undesirable content [column 6, lines 1-40]; and

- processing the response according to defined parameters [column 6, lines 1-40].

As to claim 17, Guthrie discloses the method further comprising:

identifying undesirable content in the response [column 10, lines 14-51];
modifying the response to remove the undesirable content [column 10, lines 14-51]; and
sending the modified response from the proxy server to the user [column 10, lines 14-51].

As to claim 21, Guthrie discloses that the request for content is redirected to the proxy server by establishing a session with the proxy server [column 10, lines 14-51].

As to claim 22, Guthrie discloses the method further comprising:

receiving input of at least one user-defined parameter for use by the proxy server in processing the undesirable content [column 9, lines 26-67].

As to claims 23, Guthrie discloses that the user-defined parameter is input using a browser application [column 9, lines 26-67].

As to claim 24, Guthrie discloses that the user-defined parameter is sent to the proxy server by modifying the request for content [column 9, lines 26-67].

As to claim 25, Guthrie discloses that the user-defined parameter is sent to the proxy server during a session established with the proxy server [column 9, lines 26-67].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guthrie US 6,266,681 B1 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Smithson et al US 6,898,715 B1.

As to claim 8, Guthrie does not teach that the proxy server further quarantines undesirable content.

Smithson et al teaches a proxy that quarantines computer virus outbreaks [column 6 line 13 to column 7 line 17].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Guthrie so that the proxy server would have quarantined undesirable content it was content containing a virus.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Guthrie by the teaching of Smithson et al because it prevents the undesirable content (i.e. virus) to spread throughout the network [column 1, lines 48-64].


Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aravind K Moorthy
November 30, 2006


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100